*JFK on Space — Soap Ad Style, P. 2*

**When Is The White House Going to Give Kefauver A Hand in The Steel Data Fight? See Page 3**

# I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 34 SEPTEMBER 24, 1962 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

## *Time*, The Monroe Doctrine and War On Cuba

*Time* Magazine (Sept. 21) calls for war against Cuba in a special cover article about the Monroe Doctrine. Its suggestion of "a direct U.S. invasion of Cuba, carried out with sufficient force to get the job done with surgical speed and efficiency"; its dismissal of inter-American pacts against intervention as "multilateral flypaper"; and its distortions of the Monroe Doctrine to lay a basis for such action will hurt our country deeply in this hemisphere and beyond it. It recalls how another lord of the press, Wm. Randolph Hearst, helped pressure another unwilling but wavering President, McKinley, into war. To see how the Monroe Doctrine looks to our neighbors is now a necessity. This is our contribution to it.

No Monroe Doctrine freed Latin America. "Our brothers of the north," Bolivar said, "have been apathetic bystanders in our struggle." Latin America owed its successful revolt to the weakening of Spain by the Napoleonic invasion. From that point on, Britain and the U.S. became rivals for the hemisphere. Both preferred to leave a weakened Spain in control. Britain wanted a Spain strong enough to counterbalance France but too weak to stop its growing trade with Spanish America. Once we had taken Florida, we preferred Spanish rule in Cuba and Puerto Rico rather than their liberation by the anti-slavery Spanish American revolutionists or their transfer to Britain.

### Canning's Double Purpose

The Holy Alliance of Russia, Austria and Prussia, with France, when it threatened reconquest of the Spanish colonies was a threat to England's trade and power. The joint declaration suggested to us by the British Foreign Minister, Canning, in August, 1823, was a subtle effort to block American expansion as well, by getting us to join England in declaring "We aim not at the possession of any portion of them [i.e. the former Spanish colonies] ourselves." In the Cabinet discussion which preceded the Monroe Doctrine, "Mr. John Quincy Adams thought that Canning wanted some public pledge from the United States not only against the forcible intervention of the Holy Alliance in Spanish America but also especially against the acquisition by the United States of any part of those countries." (p. 100 J. Reuben Clark's Memorandum on the Monroe Doctrine, State Dept., 1930.) The shape of things to come may be seen in the same record's notation that Calhoun was prepared for such a declaration "even if it should pledge the U.S. not to take Cuba or Texas." Adams was against the acceptance of any such self-denying pledge. The Monroe Doctrine as declared in December 1823, warned the European powers *other than Spain* to keep *their* hands off the colonies but did not pledge us to do so.

It was American rivalry with Britain, not a fraternal desire to protect Spanish America, which bulked large behind the Monroe Doctrine. In the three years after it was made, five newly independent Latin nations, Chile, Colombia, Brazil, Mexico and the United Provinces of the Rio de la Plata (as Argentina was then known) appealed to us for aid under the Doctrine against European interference but were brushed off. The Monroe Doctrine was all but forgotten for a quarter century until Polk revived it against British and French interference in the annexation of Texas and the war with Mexico. We used it as a battle cry in the Oregon dispute with Britain and in protesting British designs on California, before we took it from Mexico. The Doctrine showed itself in the Mexican war as an instrument of our own expansion at the expense of our Latin neighbors. The Hemisphere was to be our private preserve. This attitude reached its boldest and baldest assertion in the famous message which Secretary of State Olney sent the British in 1895 in the Venezuela dispute. "The United States is practically sovereign on this continent," Olney informed England, "and its fiat is law upon the subjects to which it confines its interposition. Why? It is not because of the pure friendship or good will felt for it. . . . It is because, in addition to all other grounds, its infinite resources combined with its isolated position render it master of the situation and practically invulnerable against any or all powers."

One of the simple-minded notions about the Monroe Doctrine is that it saved Spanish America by shutting off the New World from the quarrels of the old. This is only a partial truth. A sphere of interest policy always places smaller neighbors at the mercy of the sphere's dominant power, and unable to play the big powers against each other for their own protection. One reason our Revolution succeeded is that we were able to play off France against England. American dominance was as feared by Latin America as Russian power was

*(Continued on Page Four)*

### America's Two-Fold Dogma

**"The Monroe Doctrine, by its mere unilateralism, amounted to a degradation of the Latin American countries to the status of protectorates. . . . I only know two things about the Monroe Doctrine: one is that no American I have met knows what it is; the other is that no American I have met will consent to its being tampered with. That being so, I conclude that the Monroe Doctrine is not a doctrine but a dogma. But when I look closer into it, I find that it is not one dogma but two, to wit: the dogma of the infallibility of the American President and the dogma of the immaculate conception of American Foreign Policy."**

*—Salvador de Madariaga: Latin America Between The Eagle and the Bear.*



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**Is Space to Be Kept "Peaceful" By Organizing A New Armed Force to Patrol It?**

# Mr. Kennedy's Speech on Space Nationalistic Soap Ad Hoopla

Mr. Kennedy's speech on the space challenge at Houston revealed more about Mr. Kennedy and his advisers than it did about the problems of space. The most important question he had to answer was why we were spending all those billions out there in space anyway. To this he gave two replies. One, which seems to reflect a family characteristic, might be called the touch-football-after-lunch explanation; the Kennedys love activity and competition for their own sake. As Mr. Kennedy said, "Why, some say, the moon? Why choose this as our goal? They may well ask why climb the highest mountain? Why 35 years ago fly the Atlantic? Why does Rice play Texas?" The race to the moon, from this vantage point, is a way to work off excess energy, a cosmic sporting event.

Mr. Kennedy's second explanation was a flag-waving appeal to nationalistic instincts. "We have vowed," he said, "that we shall not see it [space] governed by a hostile flag of conquest, but by a banner of freedom and peace." How can Mr. Kennedy say, as he did later in the speech, that "there is no strife, no prejudice, no national conflict in outer space," when he invites them?

## "Peaceful" a La Pentagon

Many serious questions are involved in the space race. One is the problem of preventing war in space while there is yet time. Here Mr. Kennedy managed to be his usual ambivalent self. At one point, he said "We have vowed that we shall not see space filled with weapons of mass destruction, but with instruments of knowledge and understanding." A few minutes later, as though with a reassuring nod to the Pentagon, he was adding, "I do not say that we should or will go unprotected against the hostile misuse of space any more than we go unprotected against the hostile misuse of land or sea." This promises that space will be kept "peaceful"—by adding a new space branch to the armed forces.

Mr. Kennedy's reference to "hostile misuse of space" was disturbingly *un* self-conscious. Up to now only one nation has misused space in a hostile manner, by creating a new radiation belt hazardous to astronauts and by sending up U-2s and "weather" satellites to spy on other nation's defenses. He implied a readiness to shoot down such activities by others. What if they shoot ours down? How can there be peace in space if our people's eyes are not opened by responsible leadership to see our actions as they look to others?

Mr. Kennedy dragged in the Pilgrim Fathers for inspiration. The Pilgrim Fathers didn't make a fortune selling their stories to a picture magazine even before they started. No vast industry sprang up to cash in on their venture. Space deserves treatment more sober than this kind of soap ad copy.

We are tackling the tasks of space, Mr. Kennedy said, with his weakness for the mock heroic, "not because they are easy but because they are hard." They are hard only for a handful of astronauts and scientists. For industry, this is a lush cost plus operation. For the leadership, it provides glamorous politics to be photographed with the heroes. For the rest of us it is only another, though fantastically expensive, form of spectator sports.

It could be arduous for both the leadership and the led. But Mr. Kennedy's speech on the space challenge left out the important challenge—that to man's obsolete tribal way of thinking. If space is not to bring final disaster, man must be forced to grow up, a painful business. To make him see space as a human adventure, to identify our efforts with nothing smaller than the race of man, to make our perspectives begin to match its distances, to see how ludicrous the little divisions of nations look from the moon or Venus—if Mr. Kennedy really wants a hard and worthy space age task, there it is.

### Outer Space Fibbing

**"The new radiation belt . . . will not constitute any hazard to manned satellite launchings that we have planned in the near future."**

*—AEC-Defense Dept. release of Sept. 1.*

**"The explosion at an altitude of 200 miles of a megaton range hydrogen bomb over Johnston Island on July 9 has led to many unexpected results that . . . may require drastic changes in our plans for manned flights in the near future. . . ."**

*—Wm. L. Laurence, New York Times, Sept. 16.*

And Lillian Levy of Science Service, who accompanied the President on his space installation tour, reported (Houston Press, Sept. 12) admissions from Von Braun and others that if the manned space shot by Lt. Com. Schirra later this month should overshoot the mark and approach the dangerous new radiation belt our outer space test created he will be brought down after one orbit instead of the six planned.

## Gen. LeMay's Buck Rogers Vision Of New Space Weapons To "Prevent" War

**"An idea that impedes military space progress is the idea that nuclear weapons are the ultimate weapons. People say there are already enough weapons to destroy the world. This causes some people to worry about and to question the need for the development of military space capabilities. Now I don't think the nuclear weapon is the ultimate weapon. And I don't think the one that replaces the nuclear weapon will be the ultimate either. Tomorrow's weapons may employ new and non-nuclear principles of operation. For example, we are still acquiring greater understanding of the principles governing focused energy. We may see these developments lead to focused energy weapons ["lasers"].**

**"The energy directed by such weapons could travel across space essentially with the speed of light. This would be an invaluable characteristic for the interception of ICBM warheads. If a new generation of armaments operating in space could neutralize an aggressor's ICBM's, warfare as we have known it would be outmoded.**

**"The neutralization of ICBM's by a system deployed aboard a maneuvering space vehicle is no irresponsible escalation of the arms race. People who say we have an unstable military environment say that because they feel the offense has overwhelmed the defense. A weapon such as I have described would return that offensive-defensive balance. And it would move the world into a new era of warfare. More importantly, it would move the world into a new era of preventing war [emphasis in original]. Assuming, of course, that it was in the proper hands."**

*—Gen. LeMay, U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff, slightly abridged from Air Force and Space Digest for Sept. 1962.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**When Is The White House Going to Give Kefauver A Hand in The Steel Data Fight?**

# The Right to Travel, Report and Think Involved in Worthy's Conviction

Three basic issues are involved in the case of Wm. C. Worthy, correspondent for the *Baltimore Afro-American,* who has just been sentenced in Miami to 3 months of Federal prison for entering the U.S. via Cuba without a passport. One is the right of an American to come home without a passport. The second is the right of the State Department to ring down iron curtains against travel to countries it does not like; this is a relatively new practice; in the 20's when we did not recognize Russia, it was still legal for Americans to travel there. The third is the right of the State Department to facilitate the imposition of homogenized foreign policy views on the American public by forbidding or controlling travel by reporters to places like Castro Cuba and Communist China, both of which Mr. Worthy—to his credit—dared to visit without the Department's approval.

## No Way to Honor Lincoln

We heartily sympathize with Bishop Smallwood E. Williams in his protest against the plan to celebrate the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation without a Negro speaker on the program. The two main speakers were to be Nelson Rockefeller and Adlai Stevenson. For the former this only represents a chance to make political capital; the latter's attitude toward the Negro's struggle has always been tinged with a certain smugness which endeared him to the Southern conservatives. Someone like Martin Luther King should have been asked to speak. It dishonors Lincoln's memory to make the centennial a platform for white politicoes, especially when the Negro is engaged in a struggle to complete the task of emancipation. We're glad Judge Marshall has been added. . . .

A key fact in Kefauver's fight to make the steel companies disclose their costs is that their export prices have been 30 percent above those of European steel companies. This has cut the U.S. share of the world market and indicates the burden which high steel prices impose on U.S. industry. The former figures in the balance of payments problem; the latter in our lagging growth rate. But so far there is no sign of White House support for Kefauver, though his inquiry began when Kennedy asked his help last April against the $6 a ton price increase. Senate Judiciary was never reluctant to vote contempt action when some poor professor refused to give the names of colleagues with whom he had attended a radical meeting years earlier. . . .

Hitler once fooled some German Jews by claiming he was only against *Ostjude,* Jews from the East. Bonn's former Ambassador, Grewe, who taught international law under the Nazis and bored Mr. Kennedy with his humorless legalisms, recalls this by the interview he gave UPI for the German press on leaving the U.S. He complained that U.S. policy was being biased against Germany by "East Coast intellectuals." . . . The *New York Post's* gifted Paris columnist Joseph Barry reported that when de Gaulle made that speech disclosing that he had a German great grandpappy, one French news editor wanted to headline the story, "Part Aryan, Says De Gaulle." . . . If the Russians are serious about reviving the troika proposal at the UN, they've been overlooking a good argument: the Christian Heaven has been presided over by a troika for 2,000 years.

## Vilhjalmur Stefansson

**During August, when the Weekly was not published, the death at 82 of Vihjalmur Stefansson, evoked many fine tributes to his greatness as a scientist and Arctic explorer. But few mentioned that this Canadian born American of Icelandic origin was a man of liberal and sympathetic outlook who lent his name and gave his aid to many causes frowned upon during the witch hunt. He befriended and defended Owen Lattimore during the years when Prof. Lattimore was a No. 1 target of the Senate Internal Security Committee. He was a member of the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born and of the American Civil Liberties Union. He was prominent in Russian War Relief. These sympathies and activities, and his outspoken non-conformist views, deserve gratefully to be recalled. He was as ready to take an iconoclastic position on public issues as he was in Arctic studies where he so often proved to be ahead of his time.**

## A Different and Friendly View of Cuba From A Newly Returned U.S. Historian

**"While I saw much evidence of suppression, mismanagement and food shortages, I am still impressed by the positive achievements of the revolutionary regime. The Cuban economy has managed to survive the total loss of $600 million a year in United States imports fairly well: gasoline, for example, has never been rationed and still sells at the old price of 32 to 34 cents a gallon.**

**"Despite the loss of American technicians, raw materials and replacement parts, the refineries, the electric power plants and the telephone system are functioning normally. Cuba has all but wiped out illiteracy, and is engaged in a massive program of technical education; the construction of new homes, hospitals, schools and vacation hotels continues on a scale hardly matched elsewhere in Latin America. I am convinced that Castro is still supported by a majority of the Cuban people. These are some of the good features of the revolution that might be better reported if Castro relaxed the ban on American newspaper men. Cuban control of the press, however, is understandable. Many American papers have printed grossly inaccurate accounts of what has taken place on the island. . . .**

**"Cuban censorship is in part a measure of self-defense against American economic, diplomatic and military measures. The United States regularly continues to violate Cuban territorial waters and air space, to encourage acts of sabotage, to permit hit-and-run raids by Cuban exiles based in Miami, and to insist that it will "never" recognize Castro.**

**"Our own ban on travel to Cuba, and the recent conviction of U.S. correspondent William Worthy for traveling to Cuba without permission, indicate that our own devotion to freedom of the press is somewhat less than perfect. While recognizing the unpleasant totalitarian aspects of the present regime, it would be unrealistic not to admit that some of them are necessary.**

**"Castro and his advisers remember what happened to the Arbenz regime in Guatemala in 1954; they will certainly not relax their grip as long as the Kennedy Administration continues to cling to its policy of implacable hostility."**

*—Samuel Shapiro, Dept. of History, Michigan State, back from Cuba, in a letter to the New York Times Sept. 17.*



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# The Less We Talk About the Monroe Doctrine The Better

*(Continued from Page One)*

by the Turks, the Iranians and the Poles under similar circumstances. Stalin's insistence on Russia's right to have "friendly neighbors" was the equivalent of our Monroe Doctrine. The policy of the Big Stick, and Dollar Diplomacy, as practiced under Teddy Roosevelt, Taft, Woodrow Wilson and Coolidge led the Latins to reverse Canning's famous dictum and seek in the Old World some way to redress the balance of the New.

## First the Axis, Now the H-Bomb

The first challenge to U.S. supremacy was not the Russian thermonuclear weapon, which has deprived us of what Olney described as an "isolated position . . . invulnerable against any and all powers." The first challenge was the rise of the Axis under which Nazi, Fascist, and Japanese influence, abetted by Franco's anti-American appeals to *Hispanidad,* spread widely in Latin America. Even so anti-Fascist a country as Mexico turned in desperation to an oil deal with the Third Reich to end the strangling embargo which followed its expropriation of the American oil companies, as Castro turned to Russian aid under similar circumstances. It was this new situation which the Good Neighbor policy met; FDR at Montevideo in 1933 began the process of converting the Monroe Doctrine from an instrument of American domination to a hemispheric self-defense pact, buttressed for the first time by our pledges not to intervene in the affairs of our neighbors. These are the pledges, most clearly expressed in the 1948 Bogota pact, which we have been violating by our economic blockade of Cuba.

For the Latin Americans the longer range issue in Cuba is their right to carry on trade and diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union as a counter-poise to the U.S. Our hostile policy toward Cuba raises the question for them—at what point will the U.S. interfere with their Soviet relations if Cuba is crushed? When they buy cheaper oil? For us Americans, the situation is a challenge to our maturity, wisdom and patience. Let us stop talking about the Monroe Doctrine, as if it came down from Mt. Sinai; the Latins hate it. Let us think instead in terms of true national interests. We are the beneficiaries of the policies it cloaked; our great country, from sea to sea, is the fruit of conquest and expansion. It is not to our interest to have Russian bases in this hemisphere, though it be only a taste of the same medicine we give them by our bases in Turkey and Iran. But as in the 30's we must see that to preserve a friendly hemisphere we must adopt policies of equality and partnership with our Latin neighbors. War against Cuba would stir up hateful memories and split the hemisphere apart. Resumption of Cuban relations, honoring those treaties in which we gave up the Big Stick, would win us friends and enable us to dislodge Russian influence. To resume unilateral policies of force would be to invite disaster in the hemisphere, even if the Russians do nothing here or elsewhere. For it would revive fears of Yankee Imperialism, destroy the middle of the road elements on which the Alliance for Progress depends and turn a Cuban war into a hemispheric civil war. Our country's greatness and its security depend now more than ever on our ability to look at this Cuban situation with eyes neither clouded by myths about the Monroe Doctrine nor blinded by frustration that we can no longer always and completely have our own way.

### Keating's "Scoop" on Cuba

**"Washington, Sept. 16—Peruvian Ambassador Fernando Berckemeyer predicted today that most Latin American nations would support any U.S. blockade of Communist-dominated Cuba . . . in a TV interview with Sen. Kenneth B. Keating (R., N.Y.)."**

*—United Press International Sept. 17.*

**"Washington—While debate rages here over the use of harsh measures to de-communize Cuba, U.S. listening posts across Latin America are picking up a highly significant hush. . . . There is little the OAS could do now to damage Castro short of actually mounting an invasion or joining in a Cuban blockade. And the mere mention of either course, judging from the careful soundings, would acutely embarrass or even openly antagonize a lot of Latin American governments, and perhaps even threaten some with violent overthrow by Castro sympathizers."**

*—Wall St. Journal Sept. 13.*

***We'll Mail Sample Copies of This Free to Friends If You Send Long Stamped Self-Addressed Envelopes***

**I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.**

**Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:**

**Name** .....

**Street** .....

**City** .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

9/24/62

**Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:**

**(To) Name** .....

**Street** .....

**City** .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

**Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐**

*I. F. Stone's Weekly*
**5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.**
**Washington 15, D. C.**

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except during August and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED